UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,786	01/12/2001	Ralf Hofmann	P-4596	2858

7590   02/18/2005

Forrest Gunnison
Gunnison, McKay & Hodgson, L.L.P
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940

EXAMINER
BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 02/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 October 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on October 27, 2004.

The Information Disclosure Statement was received on October 27, 2004.

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by King

(5958013).

Regarding claim 1, King discloses a method for presenting a runtime

environment component service by a first computer system to a second computer

system over a communication network (Column 7, lines 48 – 50), said method being

performed by said first computer system and comprising: generating a user interface

infrastructure, on said first computer system, to receive graphic user interface events

from said second computer system and to send remote graphic user interface

commands to said second computer system (Column 8, lines 38 – 48; Column 10, line

49 – Column 11, line 8); and using said user interface infrastructure to initialize said

runtime environment component service wherein said runtime environment component

service sends graphic user interface commands to said user interface infrastructure (Column 10, line 49 – Column 11, line 8).

Regarding claim 2, King discloses receiving by said user interface infrastructure a remote input action event via said communication network (Column 10, lines 56 – 60), said remote input action event being generated in said second computer system by a lightweight component corresponding to said runtime environment component service (Column 7, lines 50 – 57).

Regarding claim 3, King discloses transmitting an input event to said runtime environment component service by said user interface infrastructure in response to said remote input action event (Column 10, lines 56 – 60).

Regarding claim 4, King discloses processing said input event by said runtime environment component service (Column 10, lines 56 – 60).

Regarding claim 5, King discloses generating a graphic user interface command to said user interface infrastructure by said runtime environment component service (Column 10, line 65 – Column 11, line 4).

Regarding claim 6, King discloses transmitting a remote graphic user interface command to said lightweight component by said graphic user interface infrastructure in response to said graphic user interface command (Column 10, lines 49 – 54; Column 10, line 65 – Column 11, line 4).

Regarding claim 7, King discloses a method for presenting a runtime environment component service by a first computer system to a second computer system over a communication network (Column 7, lines 48 – 50), said method being

performed by said first computer system and comprising: receiving a remote input action command for a runtime environment component service via said communication network (Column 10, lines 56 – 60), said remote input action command being generated in said second computer system by a lightweight component corresponding to said runtime environment component service (Column 10, lines 49 – 54; Column 10, line 65 – Column 11, line 4); transmitting a local input action command to said runtime environment component service in response to said remote input action command (Column 12, lines 27 – 38; Column 11, lines 24 – 27); processing said local input action command by said runtime environment component service (Column 11, lines 24 – 27); generating a local output command by said runtime environment component service for a graphical user interface (Column 12, lines 39 – 49); and transmitting a remote output command to said lightweight component in response to said local output command (Column 10, lines 49 – 54; Column 10, line 65 – Column 11, line 4).

Regarding claim 8, King discloses that said runtime environment component service is in an office application suite (Column 1, line 65 – Column 2, line 7).

Regarding claim 9, King discloses receiving said local output command by a local window object and in response generating said remote output command by said local window object (Column 12, lines 39 – 49).

Regarding claim 10, King discloses receiving said remote input action command by a local window object and in response generating said local input action command by said local window object (Column 12, lines 25 – 38; Column 11, lines 24 – 27).

Regarding claim 11, King discloses receiving said remote input action command by said local window object, and in response generating said local input action command by said local window object (Column 12, lines 25 – 38; Column 11, lines 24 – 27).

Regarding claims 12 and 13, King discloses that said remote input action command is a user interface event (Column 10, lines 56 – 60).

Regarding claim 14, King discloses a method comprising: receiving a command by a service executing on a computer system to create an infrastructure for executing a runtime environment component service (Column 12, lines 10 – 26), wherein said command is from a component executing on a user device; and issuing an instruction to create an instance of a remote frame window on said user device (Column 10, lines 49 – 53).

Regarding claim 15, King discloses generating an instance of a local window on said computer system by said service, wherein said local window issues remote instructions to said remote window frame in response to instructions from said runtime environment component service (Column 12, lines 10 – 38).

Regarding claim 16, King discloses that querying said remote frame window by said local window to determine properties of said remote frame window (Column 12, lines 10 – 26).

Regarding claim 17, King discloses generating, on said computer system, a local frame for said local window (Column 12, lines 10 – 26).

Regarding claim 18, King discloses receiving, by said local frame, a command from said user device to load a document (Column 11, lines 34 – 36).

Regarding claim 19, King discloses issuing, in response to said command to load a document (Column 11, lines 34 – 36), a command by said local frame to said runtime environment component service to create an instance of a runtime environment component service window on said computer system (Column 12, lines 11 – 26).

Regarding claim 20, King discloses issuing a command by said local frame to said runtime environment component service to load said document in said runtime environment component service window (Column 11, lines 34 – 36).

Regarding claim 21, King discloses issuing a command from said runtime environment component service to said local window to display said document (Column 12, lines 24 – 26).

Regarding claim 22, King discloses a method for enabling a user device to run a runtime environment component on another computer (Column 7, lines 48 – 50), said method comprising: running a browser on said user device; and running a lightweight component within said browser (Column 8, lines 38 – 48; lines 66 – 67), wherein said lightweight component receives user input actions on said user device and generates corresponding user interface events to said another computer for processing by said runtime environment component (Column 10, lines 56 – 60).

Regarding claim 23, King discloses downloading lightweight component into said user device (Column 12, lines 11 – 15).

Regarding claim 24, King discloses a computer program product comprising computer code comprising: a remote frame window class comprising: a remote output device interface and a remote frame window interface (Column 10, lines 49 – 54).

Regarding claim 25, King discloses that said computer code further comprises: a bean frame class comprising a frame interface (Column 10, lines 49 – 64).

Regarding claim 26, King discloses that said computer code further comprises: a bean window class comprising: an event handler interface; and an window peer interface (Column 10, lines 49 – 64).

Regarding claim 27, King discloses that said computer code further comprises: an abstract windowing toolkit (Column 10, lines 49 – 64).

Regarding claim 28, King discloses a computer program product comprising computer code for a method for presenting a runtime environment component service by a first computer system to a second computer system over a communication network (Column 7, lines 48 – 50), said method being performed by said first computer system; said method comprising: generating a user interface infrastructure, on said first computer system, to receive graphic user interface events from said second computer system and to send remote graphic user interface commands to said second computer system (Column 8, lines 38 – 48; Column 10, line 49 – Column 11, line 8); and using said user interface infrastructure to initialize said runtime environment component service wherein said runtime environment component service sends graphic user interface commands to said user interface infrastructure (Column 12, lines 10 – 26).

Regarding claim 29, King discloses a computer program product comprising

computer code for a method for presenting a runtime environment component service

by a first computer system to a second computer system over a communication network

(Column 7, lines 48 – 50), said method being performed by said first computer system

and comprising: receiving a remote input action command for a runtime environment

component service via said communication network (Column 10, lines 56 – 60), said

remote input action command being generated in said second computer system by a

lightweight component corresponding to said runtime environment component service

(Column 8, lines 38 – 48); transmitting a local input action command to said runtime

environment component service in response to said remote input action command;

processing said local input action command by said runtime environment component

service (Column 12, lines 26 – 38); generating a local output command by said runtime

environment component service for a graphical user interface; and transmitting a

remote output command to said lightweight component in response to said local output

instruction (Column 12, lines 39 – 49).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 27, 2004 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

Regarding the claim 1, applicant arguments that the reference, King, does not

disclose receiving user interface events from the mainframe computer. The examiner

disagrees, to describe the reference briefly, King discloses 3 network systems that are

seen in figure 2, a server (element 130), a remote computer (element 110), and a host

computer (element 140). As seen in King, Column 8 – Column 10, the host computer is

running a host application that system desires to be able to emulate over a network.

The remote computer is the computer which is attempting to gain access to an

application over a network. The server is a system that contains some of the

downloadable program that will allow the remote computer and the host computer to

setup a persistent communication session over a network so that the remote computer

can manipulate a user interface. Once that session is setup and operating, the remote

computer can send user interface events over the network to the host computer and

.those user interface events are received and translated like they are operating the host

application normally. So the second computer in claim 1, is the remote computer and it

has the ability to send interface events over the network to a first computer. The host

computer is the first computer, and it has the ability to receive those events and operate

the application and update the user interface to be seen on the second computer.

Regarding the argument to claim 7, the applicant argues that the reference King,

does not disclose a lightweight component. The examiner disagrees, the reference

discloses that the system infrastructure operates with mostly java applets, and java

applets have the ability to be quickly downloaded and operate on anything system that

can use a java engine, thus be a lightweight component for the communication process.

Regarding the argument to claims 14 and 24, the applicant argues that the

reference King does not disclose an instance of a remote frame window on said user

device. The examiner disagrees; the reference discloses a Presentation Space Object,

that is part of the java applet that builds an interface on the remote computer for the user to manipulate the host application with (Column 10, lines 6 – 22).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB
February 15, 2005

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER